Human Events THE WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

Vol. XVII, No. 30 July 28, 1960 Section 1 — News

Stop Rockefeller!

If you object to Rockefeller as Nixon's running mate, let your voice be heard at the GOP convention—by your own POLITICAL ACTION.

"Liberal" Rocky would draw not one vote to the ticket. You can't outbid the "liberal" Kennedy-Johnson ticket. Goldwater or Morton should be the Second Man.

Say so by telegram right now, addressed to Vice President Nixon, Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel, Chicago, Illinois. Wire your delegates. An avalanche of telegrams is needed to STOP Rockefeller and ensure victory in November.

Goldwater Rides in Front: If there were no Barry Goldwater, the Republican party would have to create one—so ran one remark on the eve of the GOP convention in Chicago.

Pros in the Nation's Capital believe that Goldwater, if given a place on the GOP ticket, could uniquely serve to split the South and strengthen the GOP in the whole country.

In the South, where grumbles against the Kennedy team are growing louder, the man from Arizona has a special prestige—as a confirmed believer in states rights—capable of swinging Southern Democratic leaders away from the "house of their ancestors."

In all of the country, he can feed the fuel of revolt among rank-and-file labor union members against the bosses who spend their dues money for Democratic politicians; he can provide the emotional, crusading element essential to getting out the vote and inspiring people to vote for the GOP ticket. All observers agree that the Republicans have been suffering from a public lethargy similar to that which afflicted all Democrats at Los Angeles (save the Stevenson followers). This kind of contribution by Goldwater might, indeed, prove even more important than corralling Southern votes.

Such considerations—many in the Capital think—outweigh the objection to a Nixon-Goldwater ticket on the ground of geography ("you shouldn't have two candidates from contiguous states"). In this jet-and-atomic age, geography shrinks in importance and the impact of dynamic political ideas and voter fervor assumes a higher position.

Indeed, even the "geographical" objection to a Nixon-Goldwater ticket is downgraded by pros who remind us: "Truman from Missouri in 1948 took as his running mate Barkley from contiguous Kentucky, and won."

However that may be, one conclusion is widely drawn: that, as a result of the left-wing victory by Kennedy and Reuther at the Democratic convention, Nixon has to be anchored on the right of center. He can scarcely outbid Kennedy, for the latter is virtually promising everybody everything. Nor could Nelson Rockefeller, as running mate, outdraw Kennedy and his ultra-left-wing, big spending appeal to voters.

Only Goldwater can supply the colorful attraction to conservatives—Democrats as well as Republicans—and to the great reservoir of 45 million "stay-at-home voters," the really decisive factor in the election. It was from this massive group that Ike picked up 12 million votes that gave him his big majority in 1952 (its momentum carried over into '56, adding 2 million more). Students of election statistics say that these 14 million probably included few dissident Democrats or so-called independents, because in 1952 Stevenson practically duplicated the largest vote ever polled by Roosevelt (in '36) and in 1956, when his vote declined from that of '52, he still exceeded the vote for Roosevelt in '44 and for Truman in '48. Some of this "outrush" of the stay-at-homes probably was the attraction of the victorious General's personality, but no small part was the response of conservative voters who had chosen to stay at home when me-too Willkie and Dewey stood for election.

Today, it is assumed that Ike will actively fight for the GOP ticket, since his record is under fire (both from the Democrats and from Rockefeller). Nixon will ride high as the poor boy who stood up to Khrushchev in that "kitchen debate" in Moscow last year. Add to that the glamorous conservative, jet-pilot Goldwater—and the GOP will have an irresistible ticket to steam roller the Democratic opposition. Thus runs the thinking of many Republican pros in the Nation's Capital, and they add: "This is the combination the Democratic pros fear most."

Developing Southern Bolt: When the New York *Times* on July 20 ran a story with the headline "Southerners Beginning to Talk of Bolt," it was news. For the *Times*, editorially unsympathetic to a bolt, lists an impressive array of Southern political leaders evincing great discontent with the Democratic ticket and platform, and making noises which sound very much like an outright bolt.

Governor Barnett of Mississippi is on the warpath and, according to correspondents of HUMAN EVENTS in the South, he has already been conferring with Senator Strom Thurmond (head of the States Rights ticket in 1948) about an independent ticket of Southerners. It is understood that the South Carolina Senator told Barnett, that he (Thurmond)

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would head such a ticket, if the states righters could not get anyone else.

For the Dixiecrats are talking about approaching Senator Harry Byrd to assume such a role. Byrd (who, significantly, has not commented as yet on the Democratic ticket) is cautious, and may stay silent for some time. It is known on Capitol Hill that privately Senator Byrd told friends (before the Democratic convention) that he would probably support Nixon for the Presidency.

Meanwhile, Governor Vandiver of Georgia has indicated that his state might withhold its electoral votes from the Democratic nominees and seek to throw the election into the House of Representatives. Similar thoughts emanate from Louisiana, where right-wing Democratic leader Leander Perez reportedly is in revolt against the outcome at Los Angeles. In South Carolina, Governor Hollings thinks the Democratic ticket is "better than anything the Republicans can offer." But, he adds that his state's course won't be decided until the state convention is held next month.

Eyes are on Alabama which in May elected a states-rights majority of its Presidential electors pledged to remain uncommitted, if the Democratic ticket proved repugnant to the South. Bruce Henderson, prominent states righter of Alabama, has remarked that the addition of Johnson to the ticket only made matters worse from the Southern view.

Finally, it has not gone unnoticed in Texas that Lyndon Johnson swallowed the radical Democratic platform which promises to cut down the famous oil and gas depletion tax allowance, a "sacred cow" in that state. Johnson (and his friend Speaker Rayburn) for many years has posed as political protector of this valuable economic privilege.

Johnson: Evidence emerges that it was LBJ himself who, far from taking the Vice Presidential nomination at great personal sacrifice, actually muscled his way into the second spot under threat of an open floor fight and possible Southern bolt.

In a signed AP article, publisher John S. Knight (of the powerful Knight chain of newspapers) reported that, after Kennedy's nomination, Brother Bobby was handed the Johnson ultimatum while paying a courtesy call on the Texan. When Jack heard the news, he was stunned and asked Bobby whether he had gotten his story straight. After Jack huddled with Johnson, the Presidential nominee met with his equally astonished labor and big city party boss benefactors. These Northern leaders wanted Stuart Symington on the ticket, and it took almost five hours of conferences between Kennedy and the leaders before it was decided that the Texas "riverboat gambler" had all the aces up his sleeve—they could not risk a party-shattering fight.

In his signed article, Knight stated that there would be many versions of how the Kennedy-Johnson link was forged, but "you can rely on this one. Our information came from a trusted source. As a matter of fact, the source was there."

Reportedly the Democratic high command, realizing that the politically powerful South is far from in the bag for the coming election, is fearful that the respected Knight's version of what happened will receive wide circulation in Dixie. (The Democratic high command has been busy feeding "liberal" columnists contradictions of Knight's report.) What will the South think, Kennedy aides reason, if it becomes known that Lyndon "used" his position as their leader for personal gain to blackmail his way onto the ticket—much as a faithless husband throws the mortgage into a poker game without his family's knowledge. Not a few now think the South will see Johnson as a "paper Texan," and that the coming battle cry south of the Mason-Dixon will be "Stay Away From LBJ."

Rockefeller: Nelson Rockefeller leaves no doubt that he will attempt to grab the brass ring from Nixon this week. His Chicago convention headquarters are the plushiest in American political history. The communications and press setup alone is enough to give the Army Signal Corps an inferiority complex.

Rocky's task force of analysts, speech writers, and publicity men (including the Milton Eisenhower of Albany, Rocky's leftist braintruster Emmet John Hughes) is entrenched in eleven suites in the Sheraton-Towers hotel at a rent of $1,000 each day.

The New York delegation has taken over most of the hotel's 443 rooms. Twenty-three private phones have been added to the rooms of key staff members, and a special switchboard has been set up on the 14th floor with numerous lines to key points.

The regular Rockefeller press room at the Sheraton-Towers is equipped with 30 typewriters and ten phones. The well-heeled Rockefeller volunteers have opened a separate press headquarters in the Conrad Hilton hotel, as well as a "hospitality headquarters" in the Blackstone theatre. Rocky has rented a huge indoor swimming pool and an expensive penthouse porch for the purpose of entertaining delegates and party leaders.

Lodge: Republican pros seasoned in the tough business of winning elections are not sharing the talk of some in Chicago hotel lobbies that UN Ambassador Lodge would be Nixon's strongest running mate. They note that those trying to sell Lodge are quickly hushed at first mention of the Massachusetts senatorial campaign of 1952, when Jack Kennedy soundly whipped Lodge in a Republican landslide year. No one expects Lodge to pull the Bay State away from Kennedy, and his appeal in the Midwest and South is microscopic.

Connally Amendment: Forces opposed to repeal of the Connally amendment are now girding for a fight in the upcoming special session of Congress in August. They are seeking to block the one-worlders who want to wreck US sovereignty by granting compulsory jurisdiction to the World Court.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A National Committee to Preserve the Connally Amendment and American Sovereignty has been formed and is headed by two past presidents of the American Bar Association, Frank E. Holman (famous as legal champion of the Bricker Amendment) and Cody Fowler. The new committee is counted on to offset Judge Learned Hand and his committee which seeks to eliminate the Connally amendment. The Holman-Fowler group is expected to expand and strengthen the forces which earlier this year, with a massive flood of letters to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, blocked Senator Hubert Humphrey's repeal attempt.

Drumfire of the friends of the Connally amendment is being trained on another threat to American sovereignty, which is "Executive N, or Annex V," a protocol to the recent law of the sea conventions which came before the Senate in May. The protocol to the conventions would bind the United States, without reservations, to compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court; the passage would, in effect, so far as the subjects involved are concerned, negate the Connally reservation. It would give the World Court compulsory jurisdiction to decide the ownership of valuable mineral deposits in the waters of coastal states.

It was Senator Russell Long (D.-La.) who proved a veritable "Horatius at the Bridge" by offering reservations to the various conventions similar to the Connally reservation. As columnist Raymond Moley describes it: "They [the Long reservations] would, if attached to the conventions, reserve to the US the determination of what matters would properly be within the domestic concern of the US and hence not be subject to the compulsory jurisdiction of a 15-judge court on which the US has one member and the Communists two. There the subject rested when Congress recessed."

Moley draws attention to some fantastic claims by which Senator Javits (R.-N. Y.) has sought to drum up sentiment for the anti-Connally cause. Javits claimed that, if the Connally amendment were repealed, the US could drag Castro's Cuba into the World Court. According to international lawyers, that is not so, since Cuba has never declared her adherence to the Court, with or without reservations.

Javits went on to claim that the US would have been helped enormously in its imbroglio with the USSR, over the U-2 plane, if we had not been hampered by the Connally amendment. Since the Soviets have not agreed to the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, the US could not possibly have brought the USSR before the Court.

"This sort of unilateral legal disarmament," says Moley, "is almost as perilous as unilateral military disarmament . . . . But there is great danger of such legal folly in the dog-days session in August." (To protest repeal, write your US Senators in Washington, D. C.)

Capitol Camera: The unexpected $1.1 billion surplus derives in large part from Ike's crusade against wild spending, and for the sound dollar—as financial experts analyze it. Revenues do not account for it. The President's brave vetoes of "spenders' bills" and firm hand (through Maurice Stans, his Budget Director) on Administration spending have racked up a big victory for GOP fiscal responsibility.

• Although the ADA wing of the Democratic party controlled the platform committee, Senator James Eastland extracted, after a fight, one concession—a reference to communism as "atheistic."

• Jack Kennedy dubbed his follow-up to the New and Fair Deals as the "New Frontier." Now Kennedy's phrase makers have been hit with the realization that the "New Frontier" is the name of one of Las Vegas' biggest gambling casinos.

Reds in the Congo: The revolution now going on in the newly independent Congo is definitely considered to be Communist inspired, according to informed dispatches emanating from Leopoldville.

The attack on church property and the reported violations of nuns are in accord with past practices of the Communists there, who have done almost everything to heap abuse on the Catholic Church and generally discredit it. The Catholic Church represents one-third of the population.

According to a dispatch from Leopoldville in the *Catholic Standard*, Communists are taking advantage of the present situation. But the Reds have been active for some time.

Last December, for example, Fides, a mission news agency, reported that Red propaganda was spread on orders from Moscow, and this is "undeniably threatening to ruin the confidence of a part of Congolese public opinion" with regard to the church. Even Catholics, said Fides, have been influenced by the propaganda.

Father Adhemar De Pauw, a representative of the Belgian government at the United Nations, has also said that the Reds have been at work in the Congo in the past. In last year's rioting, he charged, Red saboteurs were responsible for the destruction of Catholic churches, schools, and information centers. The saboteurs, says the dispatch quoting De Pauw, "were trained at Stalingrad in the Soviet Union."

Father Carol's Article: "Kennedy for President? A Catholic Priest Says No," an article by Father J. B. Carol, published in the June 2 issue of HUMAN EVENTS, may prove to be one of the most influential documents of this Presidential campaign. Up to the date of Kennedy's nomination, orders for 30,000 reprints of the article had been received. Within two days following the nomination, additional orders for about 10,000 came in. It will not be surprising if the reprint score passes 100,000.

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, Member of Congress from New York: "Ever since I have been in the Congress I have been a constant reader of HUMAN EVENTS. This newsletter is independent, factual and courageous. There are very few that can equal it today."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Father Carol's writings have long been known and esteemed throughout the Catholic hierarchy and priesthood in the US, and among Catholic scholars abroad. He is listed as Father Juniper B. Carol on page 961 of the 1960 (May) Official Catholic Directory (published by P. J. Kenedy Company, New York). A member of the Order of Franciscans, he lives at Saint Bonaventure Monastery, 174 Ramsey Street, Paterson, N. J.

May we suggest that you distribute reprints of Father Carol's article in your area? Prices are listed on the back of the article, which is reprinted in Section III-B of this issue (folded inside of "The Kennedy Revolution" article).

A Fading Star is Born

By James J. Kilpatrick
Editor of the Richmond News Leader

In a town that is geared to show biz, Mr. Kennedy . . . laid a large fat egg.

This was to be the grand and glorious finale to the Democrats' National Convention of 1960—it was to start the party upon its campaign with a demonstration of enthusiasm intended to throw the Republicans in knuckle-biting dismay, but the performance flopped, and it is interesting to speculate upon this lack-lustre affair as an omen of things to come with the Kennedy-Johnson team.

The event attracted an enormous crowd. There must have been 50,000 on hand in Los Angeles' vast Coliseum. They began coming at 4 o'clock in the afternoon and sat patiently in 92 degree heat, not helped by a trace of stinging fog, to watch some high school band maneuvers and to witness the Los Angeles motorcycle police in a precision drill. Comedian Steve Allen, flipping wise-cracks as deftly as a short order cook at a griddle of hot cakes, kept the crowd warmed up.

At 6:30, without advance notice, two convertibles, bearing Senators Johnson and Kennedy, entered the arena from the west. Carefully skirting the Dodgers' fenced-off infield, they made what should have been a triumphal circle. The applause was lively, but it was far from unrestrained. At the ¾ pole, the applause died altogether. There followed some remarkably pedestrian speeches.

Hubert Humphrey forgot Mr. Kennedy's middle initial. As Florida's Governor Collins launched into an introduction of Adlai Stevenson, a rump faction of the high school band, beating drums, made a straggling march down the whole of the field; a hovering helicopter provided a mosquito distraction. Following Senator Kennedy's acceptance speech, an absent-minded parson delivered the clumsiest benediction ever delivered before any audience anywhere. Mr. Kennedy himself drew precisely 85 seconds of applause. Mr. Kennedy's acceptance address, to state the matter charitably, was a fiasco—he began by praising the convention's extremely liberal platform —and this is something Virginians should remember —as "a platform on which I can run with enthusiasm and conviction." He then embarked upon some partisan political insults aimed at Richard Nixon personally; at one point in his text, he insinuated that Mr. Nixon was the sort of man who would cheat (before he deals, someone had better cut the cards) and having thus engaged in precisely the customary passions of political debate for which Mr. Nixon is so constantly denounced, Mr. Kennedy, in his prepared text, asserted piously that the times are too grave to commit the customary passions of political debate.

The candidate undertook to suggest that people should forget his religion by reminding them of it. He observed profoundly that "the world is changing," and he added the novel comment by way of explanation that "the old era is ending." He proclaimed the existence of a New Fronteah and called for a victory in a race for mastery—ominous thought—"of the inside of men's minds." He misquoted a passage from Isaiah, and concluded with a ringing assertion that "we shall prevail." That was all.

Senator Johnson smiled his riverboat-smile, Messrs. Humphrey, Symington, and Stevenson crowded around to have their pictures taken. The band played: "Happy Days Are Here Again," but one chorus was enough. A crowd that should have been jubilant, ecstatic, wild with adulation, simply sat on its hands—it was as if the Dodgers, behind 10-0 with 2 out in the 9th, had managed at last to get a man on base.

In the whole of Mr. Kennedy's address, there was none of the eloquence, the freshness of image, the statesmanship or high purpose that might have electrified both the country and the Coliseum crowd. There was no deep comprehension of the American tradition; there was none of the blood-tingling conviction we had been led to expect. This was a major league park Mr. Kennedy was playing in, and, for once, we felt inclined to agree with Harry Truman. We wondered, as he did, if Mr. Kennedy's time indeed had come.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate $12.50; 6 months $6.50; 3 months $3.50. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

For change of address send old address **EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS** on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number if any). **ALLOW US TWO WEEKS** to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound volumes indexed, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT GEORGE O. FOWLER
NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER ALLAN H. RYSKIND
Editorial Assistants: BARBARA STAMBAUGH VALERIE WEEKS
Business Manager: W. B. HICKS, JR. *Contributing Editor*: FRANK CHODOROV

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS
--- COMMENTARY

This is the magic year when knowing little and caring less gives a man the upstanding virtue of an "independent voter."
—CINCINNATI ENQUIRER

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Vol. XVII, No. 30 — Section II

July 28, 1960

Railroad Workers Ride Gravy Train

By Victor Riesel

Not since the "Great Train Robbery" has there been a script as stirring as the saga of the struck Long Island Railroad. It is the tale of unhappy conductors, some of whom earn over $15,000 a year. They are ill-tempered, despite the great green freshness through which they roll, because the management of the world's busiest commuter line whimsically believes it has the right to decide how to run a railroad without asking the local's permission.

It must be explained quickly that under an old contract the railroad's executives must get up all new schedules and train assignments 15 days in advance of the effective change. Then the schedule is sent over to the Trainmen's local headquarters for approval. The General Council of the Brotherhood of Trainmen of the Long Island Railroad has five days to veto management's decisions.

And the Council, led by a young, ambitious fellow named Harold Pryor, who spits fire like a Casey Jones' locomotive, does veto. The manning chart is gone over by the leaders of the conductors, trainmen and yardmen. They are the only Brotherhood Council in America which has the right to dismiss management's schedules for the running of trains.

The Council leaders—seven or eight in all—treasure this right, for it is a treasure indeed. The choice runs go to the senior men. They're the ones who earn $15,000 annually and will be taking home $16,000 next year. The average pay for conductors and ticket takers will be over $8,000 next year.

The best runs are those which give a man one, possibly two, round trips in the morning rush hours. Then the on-train employe "lays over." He is on his own until the evening home-going crowds push aboard. This gives him considerable free time during the late morning and early afternoon.

It's not free time, however, for the railroad. The Long Island pays for that lay over time. Thus the line pays many of its 1350 trainmen for a full 13 or 14 hours, though sometimes five or at most six hours are worked.

Now what the road wants is to reschedule the trips so that a man will work eight hours and get paid for eight hours and not for the useless lay over time.

I say useless. Not really useless to some of the trainmen. They pick up some extra money at other jobs during their lay over time. In addition, they are the only trainmen in the country who get a $700 annual cost-of-living bonus.

Thus the striking railroaders—who do not have the blessing of their national Brotherhood leaders—earn more than the working girls and guys they

haul each day while ever-increasing rates eat into their passengers' income.

No other Brotherhood locals have this veto power. For example, the Boston and Maine Railroad has just rescheduled its manning charts so it gets eight hours' work for eight hours' pay. The men aren't happy. But they recognize management's right to manage.

The Long Island trainmen's leader, Harold Pryor, has been fighting for a shift from a six to a five-day week at seven day's pay. The company agreed after Governor Nelson Rockefeller intervened. This would have given the Long Island trainmen the only such five-day schedule in the country.

When, in a closed taut conference held recently in Mr. Rockefeller's headquarters, all this was pointed out, Pryor said it was too indefinite and he didn't have the full data. The Governor then asked, "Why don't you postpone the strike?" Pryor said he couldn't. The Governor then said, "I request you to." The labor leader said, "I reject your request."

Neutral experts report that it would have taken only the shifting of 28 trainmen from their juicy runs to satisfy the company's new manning charts. There was no strike vote of the membership. The decision to paralyze the world's biggest commuter line was made by the small council.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Rockefeller's posture to businessmen, asking for their support for the Presidency, is that featherbedding must be ended in order to raise the gross national income. The Long Island Railroad provided Rockefeller with a means to show how effective he could be. There is no indication that Rocky is willing to take any political risks to achieve this objective.

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sale of Wheat 'Costs' Millions

By Congressman N. M. Mason

The government of India has agreed to pay $965 million for 16 million tons of our surplus wheat and $116 million for one million tons of our surplus rice, the payments to extend over the next four years. The wheat adds up to 578 million bushels and is sold at 50 cents per bushel below the American price of wheat. The US government loses $293.5 million on the wheat deal alone.

The catch in this deal with India is that the more than one billion dollars involved in the arrangement will not be paid in dollars, but in *rupees*—which will remain in India to be used to buy from India what we may need of their goods.

Our wheat surplus on June 30th of this year was 1,350,000,000 bushels, so the annual shipments to India will be only one-tenth of this total. The cost of shipping the wheat to India is estimated at $195 million, which we must pay. This shipping cost on top of the $293.5 million loss on price makes this deal cost the American taxpayers $488.5 million.

Commenting on this deal the *Wall Street Journal* says: " . . . a sound economy cannot be built on the sands of subsidy. And no attention whatever is being paid to the taxpayer—on whose groaning back all these subsidies rest."

Our Lawmakers

Responsive, But Not Responsible

From the Cleveland Plain Dealer

State Representative Frank D. Sullivan (D.-Cleveland) made an often-disregarded point in a discussion about taxes during the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce's annual lakes cruise.

He said that many new public expenditures are voted by lawmakers because they are being "responsive" rather than responsible. They are being responsive, that is, to the lobbyists, to the collections of organizations which stand to benefit, to the unions, to special groups of constituents. This responsiveness is shown, Sullivan frankly said, because officials want to be re-elected.

The vast numbers of people who foot these tax bills, while not getting a proportionate benefit, have no lobby except for newspapers who are interested in economy, as this one is. Individually they don't make their wishes known to the legislators. Representatives will become more responsible when the voters do, Sullivan added.

That's putting it on the line.

Candidate's Nightmare

Representative Robert W. Hemphill (D.-S.C.) tells of the member of Congress who had a horrible nightmare.

"It was terrible," Hemphill drawled. "He dreamed he had paid his own campaign expenses."—WALTER TROHAN

Soft Loans Become Flabby Under New Lending Agency

By Congressman H. R. Gross

Backed by heavy pressure from the White House and other departments of government, Congress has approved the creation of a seventh international lending agency.

This one is known as the International Development Association (IDA) and the initial cost to American taxpayers is $320,290,000. It is capitalized at $1 billion.

From Dollars to Rupees

IDA is the "soft" or "softer" loan window of the already existing World Bank. This means that if the so-called loans are ever repaid it will be in the currencies of the borrowing countries, (piasters, rupees, dinars, etc.). This means that the American dollars, as such, will never come home. Our dollars become counterpart funds of which the public has heard so much in connection with their use by junketing members of Congress and others who have been liberally supplied with them when abroad.

Incidentally, there are about $3 billion in counterpart funds in various countries of the world and these funds are growing every day.

It made no difference to the administration hierarchy in Washington that the Development Loan Fund was already in existence and in the process of peddling some $2 billion in "soft" loans throughout the world. And let it be thoroughly understood that every dollar of the $2 billion in the Development Loan Fund comes from the US Treasury—your money!

Ike Insisted

It is a strange proceeding when President Eisenhower and his Secretary of the Treasury Anderson, both of whom never fail to cry to high heaven when a domestic spending program threatens to unbalance the budget, cracked the whip over Congress to create this new outfit to spread additional millions of dollars into the far corners of the earth.

But the most galling argument in support of the legislation was that some 60 other countries will put money into the capital fund of this new agency for lending purposes. These countries may put in some money, but again it will be money obtained indirectly from the US Treasury *for there is not a single foreign country listed that does not in one way or another get assistance from the annual foreign aid program.*

Here is an example: Japan is listed to put $33 million into this new lending outfit. In the foreign aid bill for next fiscal year Japan is scheduled to get at least $71 million! We could cite chapter and verse of the same for almost every other country allegedly involved in this deal, but there is no need to take the space.

Mostly "Soft" Loans

Only last year there was created the Inter-American Bank into which the United States is now pouring a *Half Billion Dollars* and a substantial part of that is for "soft" loans.

If all this is so good for foreigners, why not open a system of federal banks in this country, each with two windows —one for so-called "hard" loans, and the other for "soft" loans? And let those who make "soft" loans pay them off in script or some other form of funny money. If this is good for foreigners, it ought to be good for Americans.

Other Nations Can't Be Bought

What is being done here is a continuation of the old story of attempting to buy our way through the world—predicting international political decisions and policies on the spending of money, and it won't work. The best evidence of this is Cuba and Japan, to name only two. There will be other American explosions, and some of them will come in this hemisphere where we have already ladled out billions.

The citizens of this country must awaken and shake off their apathy. This wasting of their substance and resources by the huge central government in Washington will not be stopped unless they do.

USIA Pays Culturist More Than Her Boss

From the Indianapolis News

Uncle Sam believes in spending plenty of cold cash in Iceland.

The United States Information Agency is now paying a woman $14,190 a year to spread American culture in Iceland. She replaced a man who drew $8,610 for the same work.

But USIA also has a public affairs officer in Iceland—the boss of the $14,190 cultural officer. He makes only $11,770 a year.

In other words, the woman culturist is getting $5,000 more than a man who has been doing satisfactory work, and $2,000 a year more than her own boss.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perils Loom In August Session

By Congressman Peter Frelinghuysen

Since Congress convened last January 6th even the page boys knew that the Democrats' convention in Los Angeles would commence on July 11th. With this deadline in mind everyone realized that there were only about 150 days, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, to accomplish our legislative objectives.

Nonetheless the pace determined by the leaders in the House and Senate was painfully slow. For twelve weeks over this six month period the House met for less than fifteen hours a week. On certain days the House met for only a few minutes, with nothing of consequence accomplished. On February 3rd we met for 19 minutes; on April 14th, seventeen minutes; on April 18th, eight minutes; and on May 9th, eleven minutes. For a total of 18 Fridays the House did not even meet briefly.

This failure to budget time, and to schedule important legislation so as to insure its adequate consideration, is most regrettable. Indeed there seems little excuse for such poor organization. Even if pressure had not been applied until May, adjournment could have been possible before the Democratic Convention.

An August session of Congress holds many dangers. By that time both parties will have chosen their nominees for President, and both presumably will be involved in the Senate's deliberations. Party platforms will have to be adopted and the outlines of the campaign debates will be shaping up. Under such circumstances it will be virtually impossible to give objective consideration to the unresolved legislative business.

Pills For No Ills

From the Cleveland Plain Dealer

Britain's Nationalized Health Service has no standardized sugar-coated pills to give to hypochondriacs who think they're getting medicine, and a London doctor has suggested that an official pill be produced by the Ministry of Health in a variety of pretty shapes and colors.

It occurs to us that the British taxpayers have been taking sugar-coated pills for a long time, thinking they were getting free medical service. New pills, however sweet, would not cure the disease of socialism!

Organized Labor Scores Again With Heads-up Political Action

From the Forecast and Review

No matter what you think of organized labor's participating in politics, it must be conceded that the nation's unions do not lack for talent. In recent years, labor organizations have developed a professional approach to political activities. They have become shrewd and hard-headed and realistic operators at every level and have developed techniques which never occurred to the old party pros.

Organized labor's latest political "gimmick" promises to be one of the most effective of all—the hiring of old age pensioners to take over the handling of the innumerable chores of political activity at the precinct level.

The old age pensioners are perfectly fitted for such a program. First they have plenty of time for the door to door canvassing necessary to obtain the vital information needed for intelligent campaigning. A precinct's political characteristics can be pinpointed in no other way.

Most pensioners can use the money to supplement their old age pensions inasmuch as outside earnings are limited by law to $1200 per year and $100 in any one month. Most of the older residents either work four afternoons a week for $6 a half day and possibly a meal or else they work two full weeks each month at $50 per week.

While tedious, the work is not hard and the oldsters are taking to it with enthusiasm. It gives them a feeling of being useful again.

One of the obvious advantages of the plan from the union's standpoint is that most of the pensioners have lived in the same neighborhood for years and are liked and respected. This enables them to gain entree to homes which would pay no attention to regular political workers.

Organized labor deserves credit for devising this campaign technique and it might be a good idea for the Republicans to do likewise. Certainly there must be a lot of elderly GOP citizens who would jump at the chance to perform similar chores. Perhaps such a program could be worked up and administered by GOP county chairmen.

New Senate Office Building Goof Can Be Remedied for $600,000

From the Baltimore Sun

Another wry and ludicrous chapter must be added to the chronicle of architectural mistakes in the new Senate Office building in Washington. The Senators cannot get out of the place fast enough to vote. When a roll call is signaled, they are trapped in their 25 million dollar palace. Not enough elevators. So it seems that two more must be installed, at a cost of nearly $600,000.

Taxpayers, whose dollars those are, may remember some of this building's other drawbacks, earlier revealed. There was the new 4 million dollar subway and terminus for the miniature railroad, which had to be cut through the foundations of the new building, and was then on the point of being sealed when someone noticed that the cars had been left out. There were the air vents that carried Senators' conversations to the corridors, the clock whose hands were so heavy that it stopped, the mail chutes that shredded the mail. There was the rubber tile on which secretaries slipped, so that $150,000 worth of carpeting had to be laid, involving the trimming of 600 doors.

Maybe this costly farce is now about ending, though we wonder. We wonder also what flaws will develop when the 66 million dollar House Office building and the 42 million dollar Capitol garage are completed, and how much money it will take to straighten them out, too.

Some Kinship!

From the Duluth Publicity

What do you think of a relative who had an income of $7,000 a year, but had run up a debt of $29,000 of which $5,000 was payable on demand and $7,500 more within a year?

Well, don't disown him too soon. Add seven zeros onto those figures and you've got your Uncle Sam.

Revolving Tax

From the Main Tax News

You pay a luxury tax on a leather billfold. You pay income tax on the stuff you put into it. And you pay a sales tax when you take the stuffing out of it.

'Education' Gems

From the Council for Basic Education Bulletin

• The American Automobile Association is not only in favor of driver training "as an integral part of the school curriculum" but claims such training can be genuinely "liberalizing."

• A sixth grade "test" given in a California school asks the following questions: "How many dogs and cats do you have and what kind are they?" "Do you sleep with your mother?" "Draw a picture of your family." "What does your father do for a living?" (On second thought, this item seems more frightening than trivial.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Dealers Courted Reds Exposed By Dies Committee

By Martin Dies in the Houston Chronicle

During the very time that our committee was investigating and exposing Communists, important officials of our government were publicly supporting them. Let me give a few instances out of many that I could cite:

On June 16, 1938, Presidential Secretary Marvin H. McIntyre received five Communist leaders at the White House and was photographed with them. The occasion of the presence of these Communists in the White House was a presentation from the International Workers Order, a Communist organization, of a portrait of the President.

Smiling Visitors

Some months later, in December, 1938, there was another scene at the White House in which McIntyre also presided over a group of smiling visitors.

On that occasion, there was a delegation from the Communist-controlled Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists and Technicians. The scene was photographed and reproduced in the CIO News for December 26, 1938.

Another picture taken at the White House shows the president of the Workers Alliance, a Communist organization, leaving a conference with the President of the United States.

White House Prestige

With the prestige of a cordial reception at the White House, it is easy to see how the Communists were able to discredit the exposures of our committee. The prestige of the White House is immense.

If the Nazi and Fascist leaders whom we exposed had been cordially received at the White House, the Nazi-Fascist movement in the United States would have acquired a popular influence in our country.

On the occasion when our committee was examining the leaders of two Communist organizations, the American Youth Congress and the American Student Union, those same leaders were entertained at the White House.

Mrs. FDR

During this period Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt was the speaker for many of the organizations we exposed.

The Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, spoke for some of these organizations and endorsed some of them.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Henry A. Wallace, and Attorney General Robert H. Jackson likewise spoke for some of these organizations and endorsed them.

Right down the line, lesser Washington officials gave their endorsement to the very organizations our committee was exposing.

Let me name a few of these officials who lent their prestige to these organizations and their leaders at the very time we were trying to inform and alert the people:

Merle Vincent, Department of Labor; A. A. Berle, Assistant Secretary of State; Henry T. Hunt, Department of the Interior; Robert Morss Lovett; Mary McLoyd Bethune, Director of Negro affairs in the National Youth Administration; Edwin S. Smith, member of the National Labor Relations Board; Paul Sifton, former Deputy Administrator of the wages and hours administration.

Tabulations such as the foregoing could be extended to fill an entire volume. Several thousand federal government officials and employees were involved in the support of the Communist Trojan horse.

Rockefeller for Butler Swap Recommended

From the New York Daily News

It has been said that Paul M. Butler was the best Democratic national chairman the Republicans have had in decades, because of his genius for making enemies among his fellow Democrats.

But even as the Democrats have their Butler, so the GOP has its Nelson A. Rockefeller, of whom it is said that he is the best Republican speaker the Democrats have in the campaign up to now.

Isn't there a possibility of a trade here—the Democrats to give Butler to the Republicans in exchange for Rockefeller? After that, these two misfits might well be stowed away in a quiet rest home, where they could bore each other to death without further annoying practical politicians of either party.

COMMENTARY reprints available: single copy 20c; 10 for $1; 25 for $2; 100 for $5; 500 for $20.

Lobby Dictates Pay Raise Bill

By Congressman Bruce Alger

All Federal employees, including postal workers, received a substantial pay raise when both Houses of Congress voted to override President Eisenhower's veto of something-for-everybody election year package Congress had passed earlier. Thus we kicked another three-quarters-of-a-billion dollar hole in the Administration budget. My views on this sort of politicking were stated at the time of the vote in the House:

"In overriding the President's veto of this pay increase, we have capitulated to the political pressure of lobbyists, in this case representing the postal workers unions. We are guilty of permitting legislative dictation. If one pressure group can do it, so can others. Then, in the aggregate total our representative government will fail. No longer will we have judicious study of legislation, but roughshod political dictation. This course can only result in the disintegration of our form of government and our society of free people.

"I condemn this pay raise as factually wrong and financially unsound, though politically expedient. Therefore, I voted to uphold the veto. The President's statement contains the facts, including his recommendation that the temporary 2.5 per cent raise already in effect be made permanent, and indicating his willingness to go along with a further reasonable hike commensurate with increased living costs.

"That this bill goes far beyond those reasonable norms is manifest. To the extent that it does, we are simply rewarding one group—well organized Federal employees—at the expense of all other taxpayers. At this time, as much as ever, we legislators need to exercise self-discipline, letting November's votes fall where they may."

Will 640-Acre Island Get UN Membership?

From the Chicago Tribune

An official notification has reached the United Nations that a 640 acre island off the African coast of Tanganyika, by the act of seceding from that British territory, has become an independent and sovereign nation. The secessionists state that their right to sever ties is countenanced by the charter of the UN in its reference to self-determination.

The new nation has some difficulty in identifying itself by geographical location, although the act of secession was unanimously adopted at a point called Winds Whisper.

We suppose that now the swarming membership of the UN will be obliged to move over and make way for the honorable delegate from the free and independent republic of Winds Whisper, who may be expected to contribute much to the debate on such grave questions as world peace, suspension of nuclear tests, etc., etc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 30 — Section III-A HUMAN EVENTS July 28, 1960

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

The Kennedy Revolution: Part I

By JAMES L. WICK

JACK KENNEDY will pick up where FDR left off—screamed big ads in West Virginia newspapers.

The ads beat Hubert Humphrey, but enraged Harry Truman who thinks that HE "picked up where FDR left off." Personal feuds have changed election results.

The advertising slogan promising a Great Leap Forward in FDR's New Deal was coined by the young man himself. To him, it was not just another campaign promise lightly tossed off to win votes in West Virginia. Jack means this promise.

His favorite topic when he is addressing college audiences is "America's Need for a Strong President." He tells them, if elected, he will not be restrained by the traditional limitations of the Constitution.

The Massachusetts Senator confidently expects THE KENNEDY REVOLUTION to be rated by historians as equalling or excelling THE ROOSEVELT REVOLUTION.

What then is the background of this not-so-modest young man who is so compulsively promising to be a Strong President?

How is he rated by those who know him best, the politicos in Massachusetts and his fellow-Senators?

If he should be elected, what would be the nature of THE KENNEDY REVOLUTION?

The essence of Jack's character is that, like many a person born to doting parents of great wealth, he has never had to think of anybody but himself, what he wanted, what would please him.

His entire training has been to receive, not to give. Jack's father, Joseph P., possessing $400 million, has given him from infancy everything his heart could desire.

The people about him were placed there to jump at his slightest command, anticipate his wants, conform to his whims and fancies, tell him what he wanted to hear. He does not understand the principle which poorer people have to live by: that society is a system of reciprocal relations; "to win a friend, you must be a friend."

Jack's schooling was in accordance with his status. The private schools which attract the sons of the very rich tend to be the "advanced progressive" schools whose teachers indoctrinate their students with the Freudian ethic that "man cannot and should not be expected to be provident, self-reliant and venturesome; that he must and should be supported, protected and socially maintained."

In all his 43 years, Jack has never had to handle money. Agents appointed by his father handle his investments. The family fortune has paid for his political campaigns. Even when Jack ran for the House of Representatives, he commanded an array of talent which would arouse the envy of a Presidential aspirant. Incidentally, Jack's first campaign for Congress was to represent a slum district in Boston, though his home for many years in the recent past had been in New York City.

The cynical belief was growing that the use of money and the power that comes through family connections makes wishes come true.

In seeking political office, he was quickly warned of the dangers incurred in passing out $5 bills. Bribing voters with your own money will land you in the penitentiary. It is far more effective to apply the basic principle of mass bribery: tell the pressure group to whom you are promising something-for-nothing that it is for the good of the whole Nation that they be given the special privilege they want.

At the 1956 Democratic convention, Jack found himself launched in a contest for the Vice Presidential nomination when Stevenson, without warning, announced that the delegates should choose the Vice Presidential nominee. The Kennedy clan conferred and decided to make religion their appeal. They drafted a memo distributed to the delegates which argued: The Catholic vote—and there IS a Catholic vote, said the memo—is indispensable to the success of the Democratic party. It constitutes more than half the Democratic vote in a dozen pivotal states. But in recent years, said the memo, Catholics in droves have been deserting their old party. Get them back by naming a Catholic, Jack Kennedy, to second place, concluded the memo. (For obvious reasons, the memo omitted an important reason for the Catholic defection: the Democratic party's record of softness toward communism.)

After the dramatic-photo-finish, the Presidency became Jack's overriding ambition. He quietly began to change his voting pattern. Up to then, on farm legislation, for example, he had voted the interests of Massachusetts. He now became an active rival of Hubert Humphrey to woo those among the farmers who are willing to sell their votes to the highest bidder.

BEFORE 1956, Jack was vividly conscious of the fact that heavily Catholic Massachusetts was strongly anti-Communist. Discussing communism in his speeches, he did not hesitate to put the blame upon Roosevelt and Truman for Communist gains. In 1949 in Salem, Massachusetts, Jack said a "sick" Roosevelt at Yalta followed by Truman "frittered away what had been won in the Far East" (namely, China). Again on January 25, 1949, just before the collapse of Nationalist China, he blamed Acheson for having taken bad advice from "the Lattimores and the Fairbanks."

The *New Republic*, now supporting Jack for the Presidency, carried a remarkable article on October 12, 1952, by John P. Mallan. The article was a report of Kennedy's speech at a Harvard seminar

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on November 10, 1950, attended by Mallan. Jack made the following points: (1) there was no reason why we were fighting in Korea; (2) we would eventually have to "get all those foreigners off our backs" in Europe; (3) not enough was being done to rid the government of Communists; (4) he knew Joe McCarthy well and respected him; (5) he had no respect for Dean Acheson or for almost anybody else in the Truman Administration; (6) he was delighted that Richard Nixon had beaten Helen Gahagan Douglas for the Senate in California [issue: Mrs. Douglas' softness toward communism].

But when he became a Presidential aspirant Jack changed this tune. He decided to backtrack on communism. The appeasement bloc in the Democratic party can veto any candidate who is not anti-anti-Communist. To them, a devout Catholic is automatically a suspect. A current witticism in the literary world says that "anti-Catholicism is the anti-Semitism of the 'intellectuals.'" The son of pro-McCarthy Joseph P. Kennedy has been doubly suspect. Jack decided to go the whole distance to win the anti-anti-Communist ADA intellectuals, who are powerful in opinion-molding circles. If, as a consequence, he should be charged with softness toward communism, he could point to his Catholic faith. The two are irreconcilable, he would insist.

Carrying out this program, Jack opposed any commitment on the part of the USA to defend the Matsus and Quemoy. He became sympathetic toward the "two Chinas" proposal of Chester Bowles, his foreign policy advisor. Bowles wants Chiang Kai-shek recognized as ruling no more than Formosa.

Jack has "promised" to make Stevenson his Secretary of State and Adlai has repeatedly said that the United States should "not veto" the admission to the UN of Red China.

Jack suggested the Red Chinese be invited to participate in the nuclear test bans at Geneva—the camel's nose inside the recognition tent.

These carefully calculated attitudes have chilled some members of the Catholic clergy and the editors of the Catholic press. Some had long been dubious about the qualifications of Kennedy for the Presidency. Others, feeling that Catholics have been excluded from their right as Americans to aspire to the Presidency, believe that Kennedy might be the man to change this American tradition.

But today many high ranking Catholics have reversed their hopes and pray nightly for Kennedy's defeat. Several lay Catholic publications have frankly expressed their vehement opposition to Kennedy. Others will remain silent, not wishing to antagonize the rank and file, many of whom are emotional about the second-class citizenship of Catholics in America.

Almost alone, the two "liberal" small-circulation Catholic weeklies, *America* and *Commonweal*, will be supporting Kennedy—and they, with mixed emotions frankly expressed in their columns.

Jack has repeatedly denied that in his current campaign he has used his religion to win Catholic votes. Others disagree, asserting that he has simply

"Thanks for the nomination!"

switched his 1956 plea. The ugly word "blackmail" is frequently used to describe the Kennedy tactics. Protestants in West Virginia, the Kennedy campaign implied, should vote for him to prove their tolerance. The West Virginia bigotry blitz shocked many voters in that 95 per cent Protestant state into voting for Kennedy "to prove that West Virginia was not populated by bigots." But Catholics and Protestants alike also had second thoughts afterwards. The reaction was so negative that many objective observers believe that Jack would have been summarily rejected by the Democratic convention if the delegates could have voted their innermost convictions.

How is Kennedy liked by those who know him best, the state political machine back home, his colleagues in the House and Senate?

JACK KENNEDY'S reputation among Massachusetts politicos is one of utter ruthlessness. At 39 years of age, when he saw that it was to his advantage, he rudely shoved aside the revered dean of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, Democratic Leader John McCormack, in his fight for control of the state organization. Said a Boston newsman who watched him closely for a dozen years: "Jack is hard as nails; he is mean and tough. Nobody—short of the voters—is going to stop him from getting what he wants."

His fellow-Senators say Kennedy has no sense of fair play whatever. One of the many stories they tell is about Kennedy's report to the waiting press when the Senate-House conference on the Landrum-Griffin labor-reform bill was breaking up in disagreement. Jack boldly told the press of offering concessions he had never mentioned in committee. He implied the conservatives were unreasonable—because they had rejected concessions they had never heard of. This false implication was considered unforgivable—by Democrats as well as Republicans. One of the members of the committee put it this way:

"Jack is a typically spoiled rich man's son. He thinks everybody on earth is here solely to do for him. But that curly-headed little kid is no weakling. Throughout his entire career, he has proven that he will run roughshod over anyone who gets in his way."

When the contest for the Democratic nomination began, Democratic Governors Brown of California, DiSalle of Ohio and Tawes of Maryland expected in traditional fashion to be favorite sons. Before long, however, they all received ultimatums to knuckle under to Kennedy or face a no-holds-barred fight for their state delegations. They surrendered, but will joyfully join together to tar and feather their Conqueror if he loses the Presidency.

Jack's arm-twisting of Stevenson is considered typical. Wooing the Adlai claque in the Democratic party—Kennedy repeatedly said that Stevenson would be offered the post of Secretary of State.

However, after his Wisconsin-West Virginia-Oregon victories, the front-runner thought he could browbeat Adlai into coming out for him. Knowing that, next to the Presidency, Stevenson most wants to direct the Nation's foreign relations, Jack sent an emissary to him with this message: "Announce your support of me by June 1st or you don't become Secretary of State."

But the Squire of Libertyville refused to be panicked. Instead, he leaked the ultimatum to the press. Stevenson fans instantly flooded Jack with messages to the effect that "if you don't want Adlai, we don't want you." The young man hastily backtracked. But he is unforgiving. After election, he would be sorely tempted in revenge to give the coveted post to the man who has shrewdly been unswerving in his support, Chester Bowles. To the country, this would be no gain. Bowles' views on appeasement of Russia, early recognition of Red China, and mammoth foreign aid to Africa, Latin America, India and Southeast Asia are identical with Adlai's.

The second article, delving into the nature of "The Kennedy Revolution," will appear in an early issue.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. $12.50 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS
408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE KENNEDY REVOLUTION: PART I" at $_____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for air-mail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription

☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $12.50

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone ____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 30 — Section III-B HUMAN EVENTS July 28, 1960

Kennedy for President?

A Catholic Priest Says 'No'

By Rev. Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M.

FOR THE NEXT FEW MONTHS the predominant concern of every thoughtful American will center, no doubt, on the forthcoming Presidential election. This year the election-consciousness of our people is bound to reach unprecedented depth, coupled with unusual apprehension. Under the circumstances, this is as it should be, for the approaching contest may well be of crucial significance not only to Americans, but to the world at large. It is even felt in certain quarters that on the decision made by the American voter on November 8 may well depend the survival of the United States as a free nation, and that of Western civilization as a whole. Hence, the tremendous responsibility weighing upon our conscience.

How are we going to meet the responsibility? Obviously, I cannot presume to tell you whom to vote for. That is a decision to be made by each individual after consulting his own conscience. But perhaps I may be permitted to indulge in a frank discussion with you as to the type of candidate we should *not* vote for. This I will endeavor to do, not prompted by partisan motives, but solely as a fellow-citizen who shares your concern for the welfare of our beloved country.

Stated briefly and bluntly, my earnest contention is this: To cast our ballot for a candidate who is imbued with the philosophy of "liberalism" would constitute a serious disservice to this Nation and to those depending on it for leadership. This bold assertion should become self-evident to anyone who reflects on the hopeless inability of our "liberals" to meet our foreign and domestic problems intelligently and realistically. To proceed in an orderly fashion, however, let us, first of all, analyze this nebulous ideology known as "liberalism."

Like modernism in the realm of theology, "liberalism" is actually a congeries of pernicious fallacies, a strange combination of muddled thinking and ill-defined, misty attitudes on such heterogeneous subjects as economics, sociology, politics, philosophy and even religion. Hence the impossibility of defining it in one short sentence. As a practical substitute, however, the following description may prove helpful and enlightening.

A "liberal" is one who favors Bigger Government at the expense of individual freedom. Thus he views with satisfaction the Federal Government's increasing intrusion in our private affairs. He enthusiastically endorses all "welfare" legislation, though it threatens to stifle individual incentive and paves the way to statism and socialism. He promotes the idea of World Government at the expense of national sovereignty. He is a fervent apologist of the United Nations, fails to grasp its dangers and minimizes its colossal failures. He regards the Constitution as an obsolete document which should be brought up to date—by the "liberals," of course. He favors curtailing big business, but sees nothing wrong in union monopoly and despotism. He upholds compulsory unionism regardless of the moral problem involved, and frowns on right-to-work laws. He feverishly defends academic freedom for fellow-"liberals," but inwardly rejoices when conservatives are denied an opportunity to present their views.

He adopts an unrealistic approach to the gravest issue confronting us today, namely, the Communist menace. Thus he champions tolerance of subversives. He congratulates the Supreme Court when it rules in favor of Communists. He decries congressional committees and the F.B.I. when they try to expose the enemies of our country. He demands more hand-outs to so-called "neutralist" countries and even to Communist governments. He heartily approves of more "cultural" exchanges with the Reds. He trumpets the current propaganda against resumption of nuclear tests. He urges more summit meetings, more negotiations with the masters of deceit. He faithfully parrots the Kremlin's slogan about the desirability of peaceful co-existence—all this is on the cockeyed assumption that the result will be blissful harmony and enduring peace within the community of nations.

HAVING DWELLED at some length on the general premise of the thesis, let us now consider its application to a concrete case by focusing our attention on one of the leading Presidential contenders. His name: John F. Kennedy, United States Senator from Massachusetts. I single him out for discussion here mainly for these reasons: (1) He embodies the "liberal" ideology to a remarkable degree, (2) I believe he stands a fair chance of being elected, and (3) owing to his religion, he is bound to enlist a high percentage of Catholic support throughout the land. Here, then, are some of the relevant facts which you might bear in mind—regardless of your party affiliation—before you decide to cast your ballot in favor of this man.

In general: Kennedy's voting record in the Senate during the past two years and a half reveals that on 97 roll calls on key issues he voted 93 times in perfect agreement with Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, admittedly the most obnoxious "liberal" egghead in Congress (See "Kennedy's Record Is Like Humphrey's," by Willard Edwards, in HUMAN EVENTS for March 10, 1960).

Specifically: Kennedy has voted consistently to condone the dictatorship of union bosses. He has voted to support increased Government interference in housing, education and other fields, thus further-

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the cause of state socialism. He has voted for inflationary measures, regardless of the staggering Budget deficit. He has voted against curbing the Supreme Court in its endeavor to nullify existing legislation protecting us from Communist treason. He has voted to pour more millions of your dollars on Communist governments like Yugoslavia and Poland. He has voted to abolish the loyalty oath in the educational aid program. He has voted to resume the sale of farm surpluses to the Communist bloc. He joined the smear campaign which led to the rejection of anti-Communist Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce. He voted in favor of "liberal" appeaser Charles E. Bohlen as Ambassador to Russia. He favors the repeal of the Connally Amendment, without which our constitutional sovereignty would be left at the mercy of unscrupulous International World Court judges.

The above is all a matter of public record. It is further corroborated by the testimony of the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action), an organization of notorious left-wingers who make it their business to influence the voting of our Congressmen. It may interest you to know that for the past two years the annual ADA report has given Senator Kennedy a 100 per cent rating, a dubious honor reserved for those who have voted according to ADA promptings on every single issue that counts.

I submit that this fact, in and by itself, constitutes the most damaging evidence against this darling of the "liberal" Establishment. Do you wonder now why the Senator during his campaigns cautiously avoids bringing up the matter of his voting record? This clever strategy has served him well in the past; it may again prove valuable in the future.

ANOTHER FEATURE of the Senator's political physiognomy little adverted to, is his tendency to play the opportunist when faced with potentially harmful decisions. The incident of the McCarthy censure in 1954 is particularly revealing in this context. As is well known, on the final roll call to decide this highly controversial issue, every Senator present or absent took a definite stand, either by voting or pairs. The only exceptions were Senator Alexander Wiley and Senator Kennedy. For five long years Kennedy could not be prevailed upon to commit himself. Then, under pressure from Eleanor Roosevelt particularly, he disclosed that he would have voted against Joe McCarthy. The point here is *not* that he was against McCarthy (all "liberals" had to be), but rather that he waited until *after* the 1958 elections to make his position known. He was well aware that, had he committed himself before the election, he would have lost the substantial support of thousands of Massachusetts voters who regarded the junior Senator from Wisconsin as a martyr.

Another interesting phase of Senator Kennedy's political career is his close relationship with Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers. It is scarcely a secret that Reuther is a ruthless labor dictator and one of the most mischievous Socialist leaders in the country. But he is also the unchallenged king-maker in the Democratic party. Hence, it is understandable that Kennedy, for obvious reasons, should always be eager to use his senatorial influence to protect the interests of this radical left-winger. Only a few weeks ago the Republican members of the Senate Rackets Committee filed a report showing tangible evidence of "corruption, misappropriation of funds, bribery, extortion and collusion with the underworld" in the United Auto Workers. Of course, nothing was done about it. Who was primarily responsible for the committee's failure to act upon the evidence? Jack Kennedy's mouthpiece, his own brother Bob, chief counsel of the committee.

As to the Landrum-Griffin bill, which was calculated to correct some of the most glaring abuses of labor bosses, it is now established that it was considerably weakened before being enacted into law as a result of the frantic efforts of none other than Senator Kennedy. All of this is bound to pay dividends. For you may be sure that the beneficiaries of such tender solicitude will see to it that, at the critical moment, a mighty army of over a million shop stewards and union officers will be swiftly mobilized to bring victory to their knight-errant from Massachusetts.

WHAT WOULD BE some of the salient features of an Administration headed by Kennedy? This is what you can expect: more Government interference and control; more spending on welfare measures; the eventual admission of Red China to the United Nations; the gradual surrender of our constitutional sovereignty to a World Court made up mostly of our enemies; the probable appointment of visionary Adlai Stevenson as Secretary of State, with its consequent crawling appeasement of the Reds; and, of course, the packing of the Supreme Court with "liberal" ideologues who will make shambles of our security laws. But why go on? The foregoing should be enough to chill the enthusiasm of the most fanatic Kennedy backer.

Now I ask you: is this the kind of leader our country needs in the decisive encounters now being schemed by the Russian Bear? No matter how formidable our military resources; no matter how intrepid our men in the armed forces; no matter how irrepressible our will to survive, if the men at the top are found wanting in vision, realism, courage and stamina, our crushing defeat as a free nation seems to me inevitable, under the circumstances. Remember: an army of bears led by a sheep hasn't got a chance with an army of sheep lead by a bear.

Father Carol, a Franciscan priest, is editor of the Catholic publication *Marian Studies*, Paterson, N. J.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "KENNEDY FOR PRESIDENT?" at $_____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies, $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 30 — Section IV HUMAN EVENTS July 28, 1960

You Bet I Am A Republican

Because Now I Know the Difference Between the Parties

By JOHN J. SYNON

ALONG WITH A NUMBER of my more erudite friends, I have sat in the petulant's corner wondering what difference there is between the Republican and the Democratic parties; why should I support either?

Tweedle-dum and Tweedle-dee, I have said, and felt a bit righteous and above it all in doing so.

And now I wonder, Conservative that I am, if a large measure of my concern has not been the result of my own political hysteria. For the facts do not bear out my convictions. I have learned, indisputably, that the Republican party—as a party—has lent little aid and comfort to the collectivists and is little to be damned for our plight. Republicans are not responsible; *IT IS THE LACK OF REPUBLICANS.*

Admiral Ben Moreell
Americans for Constitutional Action
20 "E" Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Admiral Moreell:

Your ACA-Index is the finest work of its kind ever put between covers . . . .

Sincerely,
Barry Goldwater
US Senator

That may surprise you as it surprised me. Yet I am prepared to prove it.

For six weeks now I have been pouring over the ACA-Index, an extraordinarily illuminating work put out by Americans for Constitutional Action, a non-partisan trust. This great book is a deep-down study of the voting record of each member of Congress. It takes the Senate back through 1955 and the House back through 1957; *every critical vote of record on every crucial issue*—79,500 *entries.*

As might be expected, the ACA-Index is as full of surprises as a bear cub in the springtime, yet nothing it contains is so striking as the difference it spells between the parties. An honest appraisal of the book will convince any fair-minded person ***the Republican party has held true to constitutional principles. While the Index doesn't say this in so many words, the implication is clear and if the*** 5,000,000 ***Conservatives who have "taken a walk" can be made to appreciate this fact, they can of themselves make of their party a majority party and reverse our movement to collectivism.***

It is that simple.

Let me show you how the ACA-Index, in its dispassionate way, proves this: Assume that every member of Congress voted for constitutional principles every time he cast a ballot. If that were so, the "median" of Congress would be 100 per cent. If, collectively, the members of Congress voted half the time for constitutional principles and half the time against them, the "median" would be 50 per cent. As a matter of fact, the "median" of Congress, as disclosed by the ACA-Index, is 33 per cent. Coincidentally, it is the same for the Senate as the House.

Now in the House of Representatives:

REPUBLICANS		
Above the Median	**151**	**100%**
On the Median	**0**	**0**
Below the Median	**0**	**0**
DEMOCRATS		
Above the Median	**58**	**21%**
On the Median	**6**	**2%**
Below the Median	**213**	**77%**

Look at it a little differently. There are 277 Democratic members of the House. Of them, the ACA-Index discloses, 200 have records of 29 per cent or less. This means that 70 per cent of the time, 200 Democratic Congressmen are voting for welfarism. *Not one Republican votes that poorly.*

Or to be more specific, the Democratic Majority Leader in the House, McCormack of Massachusetts, has not cast a single vote of record that Conservatives would term a "good" vote. Not since 1956, at least, as far back as the Index takes him. McCormack is rated zero,zero, zero. His voting record shows him to be totally for centralization of power in the Federal government and in complete opposition to the principles spelled out in the Constitution. And this is the Democratic party's Majority Leader in the House of Representatives, a cypher.

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the other hand, the Republican House Leader, Halleck of Indiana, subject to identical analysis, rates 87 per cent. A great record.

And the story is no different in the Senate:

REPUBLICANS

Above the Median	**31**	**94%**
On the Median	**1**	**3%**
Below the Median	**1**	**3%**

DEMOCRATS

Above the Median	**15**	**23%**
On the Median	**2**	**3%**
Below the Median	**47**	**74%***

The Democratic Senate Majority Leader, Lyndon Johnson—whom many people think is a Conservative—rates 10 per cent. The Democratic Whip, Mansfield of Montana, rates eight per cent.

Conversely, the Republican Senate Minority Leader, Dirksen of Illinois, rates 79 per cent. And Senator Kuchel, as Republican Whip, rates 58 per cent.

But this is only the beginning. You Conservatives who stayed away from the polls, look at your party:

There are 437 members of the House of Representatives. Of these, 13 have never, not once—at least, not since 1956—*have never cast a vote of record on a critical issue that was in violation of the principles written into our Constitution. Every one of these* 13 *members of Congress who have earned a* 100 *per cent rating is a Republican.* There are no such Democrats—North, South or East of Suez.

Of the 113 "best" members of the House (i.e. those who have voted least for collectivist measures.), *every one of them is a Republican.*

Turn it around. The lowest-rated Republican in the House rates better than 221 Democrats. That means exactly what it says: The record shows the "worst" Republican is better than 221 Democratic Congressmen. And of the 21 Representatives who have *never* cast what a Conservative would call a "good" vote (those the ACA-Index rates at zero), *every one them* is a Democrat. Of 151 Republican members of the House, only three rate below the 40-per-cent-Conservative level; there are 233 (of 277) such Democrats.

SUCH IS THE DIFFERENCE between the parties. It is a deep and abiding difference and those Republicans who have continued to fight for the God-given rights of the individual are due a sincere expression of gratitude from the country at large and a sincere expression of apology from those of us who walked away—because we couldn't tell the difference between a Republican and a Democrat.

It seems apparent, our Republican members of Congress have been "good." They can be better, but to be better, they need help—your help and mine.

For more than a year, the technical staff of Americans for Constitutional Action worked industriously to gather these facts and bring them to light. (Ben Moreell, Herbert Hoover, Charles Edison and Edgar Eisenhower are members of the nonpartisan board of ACA.) Now they have produced them—for your benefit. Our country is worth saving and it is within our power, within the power of those of us who have dragged our political feet, to save it. *The answer lies in supporting the Republican party; do so and you will strengthen the constitutional principles upon which our liberty is based. The ACA-Index proves this fact.*

We Conservatives can win—if we will.

If your spirit remains Conservative, make your label Republican.

Working Republican, that is.

*Senator Langer (deceased) and the two new Senators from Hawaii are not included in the study by ACA.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS 408 First St., S. E. Wash. 3, D. C.

Please send me the ACA-Index at $15. Five or more copies $12.50 each.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "YOU BET I AM A REPUBLICAN" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins, not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first class delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $12.50

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 30
SECTION V

HUMAN EVENTS
JULY 28, 1960

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

5,361 Votes Could Have Changed the Course of History . . .

In 1948, a switch of 3,554 votes in Ohio and 1,807 votes in Illinois would have sent the Presidential election to the House of Representatives.

With what consequence nobody knows.

But it should be mentioned that the time when the House of Representatives would have met to make its choice of President, China had not yet been lost. Dean Acheson had not made his famous speech to the National Press Club which excluded Korea from the area the United States regarded as vital to its defense. The Korean War—the only war America has lost—might never have occurred if someone other than Truman had been President or, if the war had occurred, it might have been won.

These speculations show how a small number of energetic enthusiasts can change the course of history.

It is entirely possible that YOU—just ONE person—may decide the coming election.
How? By MULTIPLYING YOURSELF.

You know dozens of persons who can be stirred into activity if they are supplied with inspiration and ammunition.

Stimulate them to action by giving each of them a 4-months subscription to HUMAN EVENTS. Special price, $3.75 for four months—which carries the subscription through the election.

The articles in HUMAN EVENTS will often be exactly what these persons will buy in large quantities for distribution to their neighbors, friends, associates, employes.

In making up your list of gift subscriptions, consider the following: Persons in your industry, profession, occupation. Your employes.

Your suppliers and customers. They think highly of you and will give serious thought to your suggestions.

Precinct captains.

Officers of your chamber of commerce, civic and service clubs, patriotic organizations; women's organizations.

Political and union leaders.

Teachers.

Unless you specify otherwise, your name will be listed on a gift card accompanying the first issue of HUMAN EVENTS.

Rush your list TODAY. COPE (The AFL-CIO political arm) is already organizing and energizing its force: one million shop stewards and union officials. In a close race, YOUR activity may be decisive. There is NO TIME TO LOSE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Reflections On FDR

By ROSALIE GORDON

THAT STAUNCH DEFENDER of the "liberal" line, the New York *Post*, has become very much exercised over a TV film—and an unused one at that. When the *Post* becomes exercised, it goes all out, even to the extent of a front-page headline in red ink ("TV AND THE FDR IMAGE") to call its readers' attention to a great revelation by its TV and radio columnist.

It seems that a while back, an NBC producing unit put together a so-called "documentary" called "Back in the Thirties." The *Post's* indignant columnist hadn't seen the film, but he assumed it "must have been a honey"—because it was built around the image of Franklin D. Roosevelt as the Great White Father who brought about all the "reforms" of the decade before last. The film has lain on the shelf because NBC could not get a sponsor for it. This is the *Post's* Beef No. 1—that so-called "big money" sponsors won't put up the dough to whitewash the reputation of a man who nearly put them, and the American system, out of business.

The *Post's* Beef No. 2 is that the film in now being remade to give, presumably, both sides of the story. Why this should call for big red headlines and an "expose" we do not know—unless, perhaps, even the "liberals" are beginning to realize that their god was only tin and must therefore be preserved in a coating of gilt to conceal the phony product before whom they would have us all pay obeisance.

However, aware of what often happens to TV documentaries which give "both sides of the story," we would like herewith to offer—free, clear, and with no strings attached—several script ideas on "FDR in the Thirties." They could all be done in one show—in the quick, five-minute segments so dear to the hearts of documentary-producers—or each could fill a series of 15-minute films.

FDR Fights Communism: Scene I. The time: 1938. The place: The White House. The characters: FDR and Martin Dies, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Flashback to House hearing room, where Dies has been exposing Communist infiltration of labor unions. Then back to White House. Dies is there at the President's command. FDR tells Dies to quit investigating communism. The President speaks: "There's no one interested in communism, no one at all. I've heard it all my life. There is no menace here in communism."

Scene II: A year later, in the midst of the Hitler-Stalin Pact. Adolph Berle goes to FDR. Tells him about a meeting he has had with a man named Whittaker Chambers. Chambers wants to warn the United States Government about

—*Burck in* The Chicago Sun-Times.

"Now—There Was Yalta. . . ."

Red cells operating in Washington. FDR to Berle: "Go jump in the lake."

(*This might supply the introduction for still another documentary. It could be carried forward to the Yalta Conference, with Alger Hiss sitting behind FDR at all the sessions, and wind up with the trials and conviction of Hiss.*)

There is a possibility for still another scene—FDR's and Eleanor's long friendship with the Communist-dominated American Student Union and American Youth Congress. The "youths" could be shown covorting on the White House lawn, running in and out of the White House, sleeping in the Lincoln bedroom, etc. Here even the New York *Post* might be found on the side of the angels, since James Wechsler, its editor, might be induced to play himself in the halcyon days when he was part of the pro-Communist youth movement.

The Mama's Boy Who Finally Made Good: Quick, short scenes showing FDR's various attempts at business ventures during the 'twenties, all of which blew up. Egbert Murrow's lugubrious voice would be perfect for the narration. Scene shifts to Warm Springs, Georgia, where FDR is trying to build up a paying health resort. He has sunk a good deal of money into it and it is in debt. The time is 1928. Al Smith has been nominated for the presidency. The Democratic leaders in New York need a man with the name "Roosevelt" to run for governor. Telephone calls between John J. Raskob and FDR, urging him to run. Finally Raskob guarantees FDR $250,000, to bail out Warm Springs, and Roosevelt agrees to the nomination. The struggling "aristocrat" from Hyde Park is on his way.

Main scene: Tremendous business success achieved by FDR, his loving and devoted family, once they are in the White House. FDR on telephone to John Hartford of A & P, urging him to lend his son Elliott $200,000 (a loan settled for $4000). Jimmy Roosevelt making a great success at selling insurance to companies which had to deal with the government his father headed (perhaps the Representatives from the 26th California district could be induced to appear personally in the film).

Mrs. FDR becomes a successful radio personality plugging toilet articles, mattresses, coffee at $1000 *to* $4000 *a show. She can be shown as always the gracious lady—the coffee advertising account being taken away from the company which had handled it and being given to one in which Harry Hopkins' son was interested.*

Another facet of the FDR success story—which would appeal to millions of stamp collectors in the TV audience—would be the manner in which he built up his stamp collection once he was in the White House. Having access, as President, to the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, his formerly modest collection sold for $275,000 after his death.

FDR's Sense of History: This episode would provide an opportunity for beautiful TV shots of the lovely upper Hudson River Valley, where FDR built a memorial library to himself, on his own grounds, while he was still alive. Then he generously turned the whole thing over to the government which he headed, so that it could be supported then, and ever since, by the American taxpayers.

FDR as Defender of Freedom of the Press: Scene would show FDR writing to Wilbur L. Cross in 1939. Cross, a former Governor of Connecticut, was editor of the *Yale Review*. He printed an article by the well-known writer and New Deal critic, John T. Flynn. The article was a fairly sober analysis of the activities and character of the President's chief aide, Harry Hopkins. Of course FDR did not like the article (there should be no reference in the script to Voltaire and his most famous phrase), so he wrote Governor Cross that "John T. Flynn should be barred hereafter from the columns of any presentable daily paper, monthly magazine or national quarterly."

We could go on like this. But any TV script writer worth his salt should see the possibilities. We leave it in his hands. Not that we have any hope of ever seeing such events portrayed on the TV screen, but should the impossible happen, we would confidently look for at least one issue of the tabloid New York *Post* being printed full size—to make adequate room for the necessary red-ink headlines.

Reprints available: single copy 15c; 15 copies $1; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED